

Comments on the proposed designation of *Agathis longicauda* Boheman, 1853 as the type species of *Vipio* Latreille, 1804 (Insecta, Hymenoptera)
(Case 2614; see BZN 48: 45–49, 248–250)

(1) W.R.M. Mason

22 Oakwood Avenue, Nepean, Ontario, Canada, K2E 6A5

I consider that Dr van Achterberg is mistaken in calling '*Ichneumon desertor* Fabricius, 1775' a synonym of *I. desertor* Linnaeus, 1758. Fabricius himself referred to the species as '*I. desertor* Linn.' '*I. desertor* Fabricius' is a misidentification and this was known even in Napoleonic times (Spinola, 1808; Nees von Esenbeck, 1812; see BZN 48: 46, para. 5). Nees von Esenbeck (1834, p. 139) placed *Bracon deflagrator* Spinola, 1808 (a replacement name for *desertor* Linnaeus) in *Agathis* Latreille, 1804 but (p. 125) placed *desertor* sensu Fabricius in *Bracon* (*Vipio*).

The type species of *Vipio* Latreille, 1804 is not *desertor* Linnaeus. Foerster (1862) clearly designated *desertor* sensu Fabricius as the type and I believe that this was deliberate because he (along with most other 19th century students of braconines) would have been familiar with the misidentification. If not, why did Foerster use Spinola's (1808) replacement name *deflagrator* for *desertor* Linnaeus when designating the type species of his new genus *Cremnops* in the same publication?

It follows from Articles 11i and 70c of the Code that, by his (1862) action in deliberately designating a known misidentification as the type of *Vipio*, Foerster created a new nominal species, *Vipio desertor* Foerster, 1862, and this is not the same nominal species as *desertor* Linnaeus. Thus, since the true identity of *V. desertor* Foerster can scarcely be determined from the composite series of specimens left in the Fabricius collection (van Achterberg, 1982), and since the traditional identity has had an element of vagueness for well over a century, we request the Commission to designate a suitable nominal species (*Agathis longicauda* Boheman, 1853) as the type of *Vipio*.

With regard to the 'maintenance of existing usage' specified by the Code (Article 80), I believe that in this case the usage should be that found in the literature in the last few decades before 1982, when Dr van Achterberg published his findings on examining the Fabricius collection. The summary of usage at the time is given in the application (BZN 48: 47, paras. 10 and 11).

Dr van Achterberg claims that *Vipio* is a senior synonym of *Cremnops*. It should be noted that *Vipio* is the type genus of the family-group VIPIONIDAE Viereck, 1916 and it seems most unlikely that a generic revision will ever result in moving it to a different subfamily in the way that misapplication of the rules might.

Additional reference

Nees von Esenbeck, C.G. 1834. *Hymenopterorum Ichneumonibus affinium monographiae, genera Europaea et species illustrantes*, vol. 1. xii, 320 pp. Stuttgart.

(2) Robert Wharton

Department of Entomology, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas 77843, U.S.A.

It seems clear from the early literature, as reviewed in the original application, that Fabricius (1775) misidentified *Ichneumon desertor* Linnaeus, and that the species which

came to be associated with this misidentification was deliberately chosen as the type species of *Vipio* Latreille, 1804. Article 70c thus applies and fixation by the Commission of *Agathis longicauda* Boheman, 1853 as the type species would solve the problem of the identity of *Ichneumon desertor* sensu Fabricius.

The fact that Latreille (1804) in his original description of the genus described *Vipio* as a braconine rather than an agathidine indicates that a misidentification of *desertor* Linnaeus (an agathidine) was involved. Foerster (1862) selected *desertor* sensu Fabricius as the type, from among the three species originally included by Latreille, and he also clearly placed *Vipio* in the BRACONINAE. Transfer of *Vipio* to the AGATHIDINAE thus not only goes against all usage prior to 1982 but is also contrary to the original definition of the genus.

Publications subsequent to van Achterberg (1982) serve only to affirm that stability has not been achieved and that a decision by the Commission is needed to resolve this problem. At stake is not merely the replacement of one generic name by another. Rather, it is the transfer of a widely used name (*Vipio*) from the subfamily BRACONINAE to the subfamily AGATHIDINAE which will have the greatest impact on stability. *Vipio* and VIPIONINI had never been included in the AGATHIDINAE prior to 1982, and the two subfamilies are not closely related.

I have recently been able to borrow the type series of *Agathis longicauda* Boheman, 1853 thanks to the diligent efforts of Per Inge Persson of the Riksmuseum, Stockholm, who located the series and provided information on its status. The specimens are in excellent condition, match the original description, and the four specimens examined all represent a single species. *A. longicauda* is a true *Vipio* in the sense of *desertor* sensu Fabricius. I had been led to believe that there was a holotype (see BZN 48: 46, para. 7), but there is no question from the labelling on the specimens that there is actually a type series. I have labelled a lectotype (bearing the following labels: (1) Sc. ar. [= Scanis arid]; (2) Bhn [= Boheman]; (3) 487 91 [pink label designating loan number for 1991]; (4) Riksmuseum Stockholm [green]; (5) my lectotype label [red]) and herewith designate this specimen as such.

(3) Paul M. Marsh

Systematic Entomology Laboratory, United States Department of Agriculture, c/o National Museum of Natural History NHB-168, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

I wish to support the proposal by Drs R.A. Wharton & W.R.M. Mason concerning the braconid genus *Vipio* Latreille, 1804. The genera *Vipio* and *Cremnops* Foerster, 1862 have been in use for very many years. *Cremnops* was revised for North America in 1961 and *Vipio* is presently being studied. It is critical to stabilize these names for future studies.

(4) Scott R. Shaw & Mian Inayatollah

Department of Plant, Soil and Insect Sciences, College of Agriculture, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming 82071-3354, U.S.A.

We write to express our complete support for the application of Drs Wharton & Mason, which would maintain the usage of *Vipio* Latreille, 1804 (in BRACONINAE) and *Cremnops* Foerster, 1862 (in AGATHIDINAE). Their proposal is carefully researched and provides a reasonable solution to a difficult problem. Since this case involves the

misidentification of a type species, rather than asserting authoritatively that *Vipio* is the senior synonym of *Cremnops*, van Achterberg (1982) should have referred the case to the Commission (Article 70b). The use of *Vipio* as the senior synonym of *Cremnops* would be very disruptive to current usage, since *Cremnops* has been fairly recently revised in both North America and Europe (Marsh, 1961; Nixon, 1986), and many common species are well known under that name. On the other hand, the proposal of van Achterberg (1982) has not gained any sort of general acceptance. Although Quicke (1987) did follow van Achterberg and used *Isomecus* Kriechbaumer, 1895 as the valid name for *Vipio* auctt., this position was reversed in Quicke & Sharkey (1989) where *Vipio* was once again used as the valid name for the genus in the BRACONINAE. Nixon (1986) argued against the use of the name *Vipio* in the AGATHIDINAE. The designation of *Agathis longicauda* Boheman, 1853 as the type species of *Vipio* is a viable solution that preserves the stability of both generic names in the sense that they have been used for many years. It would be most desirable for the Commission to find in favour of the proposal of Wharton & Mason.

Additional reference

Marsh, P.M. 1961. A taxonomic study of the genus *Cremnops* Foerster in America north of Mexico (Hymenoptera, Braconidae). *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **54**(6): 851–861.

Comments on the proposed precedence of HOMALOPTERIDAE Bleeker, 1859 over BALITORIDAE Swainson, 1839 (Osteichthyes, Cypriniformes) (Case 2703; see BZN 47: 277–279; 48: 148–150, 253)

(1) Maurice Kottelat

Zoologische Staatssammlung, Münchhausenstrasse 21, D-8000 München 60, Germany

I read with some surprise Herr Hieronimus's application (BZN 47: 277–279). This is based on a review of only part of the literature and does not reflect even a basic understanding of the taxa concerned. While disagreeing completely with it, I wish to make the following observations.

I (Kottelat, 1988) restored the family-group name BALITORIDAE Swainson, 1839, rather than using HOMALOPTERIDAE Bleeker, 1859, because BALITORIDAE is the senior name and because there are taxonomic problems in applying the name HOMALOPTERIDAE. These derive from uncertainty about the type genus of the family, *Homaloptera* van Hasselt, 1823. The type species *H. ocellata* van der Hoeven, 1833, as described and illustrated, cannot be recognized with certainty. Alleged type material in two museums (Amsterdam and Leiden) cannot be identified beyond doubt as being the types (see Hora, 1932); I am also not convinced that the specimens represent a single species. In addition, the name *H. ocellata* has usually been associated with a species (sensu Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1846; Weber & de Beaufort, 1916) very different from van der Hoeven's and this usage still persists in fisheries reports and is standard practice in the country concerned (Indonesia). Moreover, *Homaloptera* as presently understood is a catch-all genus which will probably be split into two or three genera once correctly revised. I would not exclude the possibility that for the sake of stability a further application would be needed at that time to designate another type